UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,652	11/25/2003	Glenn R. Gibson	8497-US	7110
74476 Nestle HealthCa	7590 02/13/200 are Nutrition		EXAMINER	
	oad, 2nd Floor, Box 697	BARHAM, BETHANY P		
Florham Park, NJ 07932			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1615	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/13/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdepartment@nestle.com athena.pretory@us.nestle.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/721,652	GIBSON ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
	' •	

	BETHANY BARHAM	1615						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>21 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid abar ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) $\stackrel{.}{\boxtimes}$ The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (l	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of the control of the c	,	36(a) and the appropriate	o oxtoneion foo					
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ite extension fee e action; or (2) as					
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	lianaa with 27 CED 41 27 must be f	ilad within two months	of the data of					
filing the Notice of Appeal was filed off A brief in compliance of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	appeal. Since a					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause					
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);						
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant Americanient (i	10L-32+).					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allength non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	•	_					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1.6-8.10.11.26 and 27.		be entered and an ex	planation of					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
13. Other:								

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claim amendment will NOT be entered, the claims as amended would require new search and bring up new matter issues. As such the previous rejections of record stand, namely independent claim 1 recites a dosage of about 25g which is not found in the instant spec and that it is new matter, further the spec does not enable one to make and use a FOS/GOS composition of any amount higher than 9.86g found in instant Example 3. Further, the instant spec does not teach any components that would materially change the characteristics of the instant invention FOS and GOS composition and as such instant claim 27 is treated as 'comprising' and Applicant bears the burden of showing the introduction of additional components would materially change the characteristics of the invention, per MPEP 2163. As to the enablement and prior art rejections, Applicant's claim of a 'prophetic' example for the amount of about 15 or about 20 grams of fiber is not persuasive as the prior art of record teaches that an amount of fiber above 10 g in a single composition causes discomfort/gas/bloating, Applicant must provide data, experimental results, etc to refute this fact not merely arguments. As such the rejections of record are maintained and claims 1, 6-8, 10-11 and 26-27 are rejected.

/MP WOODWARD/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1615